

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 27-46 and 57-62 remain pending in the present application, Claims 1-26, 47-56
4 and 63 being currently canceled in response to a Restriction Requirement, subject to applicants' right
5 to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected inventions, Claim 40 having
6 been amended to correct a misspelled term and Claims 27, 39, and 57 having been amended to more
7 clearly define the recited subject matter.

8 Claims Rejected Under Non-Statutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

9 Claims 27-46 and 56/sic/62 are rejected based on non-statutory obviousness-type double
10 patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 7,265,669 (Application
11 No. 10/791,057) entitled "Networks With Sensors For Air Safety and Security." In addition,
12 Claims 27-46 and 56/sic/62 have been rejected under the same basis over Claims 1-88 of U.S.
13 Patent No. 6,887,710 (Application No. 10/066,404) entitled "Robust System For Screening Mail For
14 Biological Agents." Applicants believe that a typographical error resulted in Claims 56-62 being
15 rejected, as they believe based on the previous Restriction Requirement, that the Examiner intended
16 to reject Claims 57-62.

17 Claims Rejected Under Provisional Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

18 Claims 27-46 and 56/sic/62 are provisionally rejected based on non-statutory obviousness-
19 type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-54 of copending Application
20 No. 10/066,404 (now issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710, entitled "Robust System For Screening
21 Mail For Biological Agents"). In addition, Claims 27-46 and 56/sic/62 are provisionally rejected
22 under the same basis as being unpatentable over Claims 1-28 of copending U.S. Application
23 No. 10/791,189 entitled "Biological Alarm."

24 The Examiner specifically notes that a terminal disclaimer, signed by an attorney of record,
25 can be used to overcome such double patenting rejection. Such a terminal disclaimer is submitted
26 concurrently herewith, with respect to U.S. Patent No. 7,265,669 and U.S. Application
27 No. 10/791,189.

28 However, applicants respectfully disagree with the double patenting rejection based on the
29 claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 as noted below.
30

1 Traversal of Non-Statutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710

2 Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 27, 39, and 57 of the above-identified
3 application are NEITHER anticipated by NOR obvious over Claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent
4 No. 6,887,710.

5 MPEP § 804 II.B.1.a indicates that if the application at issue is the later filed application or
6 both are filed on the same day, only a one-way determination of obviousness is needed in resolving
7 the issue of double patenting. In other words, since the above-identified application is the later filed
8 application, this section of the MPEP indicates that the double patenting analysis should determine
9 whether the invention defined in a claim in the above-identified application would have been
10 anticipated by or an obvious variation of the invention defined in a claim in the 6,887,710 patent.
11 Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 do not anticipate nor
12 render obvious the claims of the above-identified application.

13 Specifically, independent Claims 27, 39, and 57 have been amended to recite *a planar*
14 *collection surface, a surface regenerator for regenerating the collection surface such that particles*
15 *collected before regenerating the collection surface are substantially no longer present to*
16 *contaminate a spot of particles collected after regenerating the collection surface, and an analyzer*
17 *configured to analyze the collected particles while they are retained on the collection surface.*
18 Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 do not teach or suggest
19 these aspects of the currently pending claims.

20 The Claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 do NOT Anticipate the Pending Claims

21 As noted above, each pending independent claim recites the following elements: *a planar*
22 *collection surface, a surface regenerator for regenerating the collection surface such that particles*
23 *collected before regenerating the collection surface are substantially no longer present to*
24 *contaminate a spot of particles collected after regenerating the collection surface, and an analyzer*
25 *configured to analyze the collected particles while they are retained on the collection surface.*

26 Claims 1-88 recite various elements, including means to distinguish between biological and
27 non biological particles (i.e., an analyzer, see Claims 4 and 15). Significantly, the analyzer recited in
28 the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 is not configured to analyze particles *while the particles are*
29 *retained on a planar collection surface.* Note Claims 22, 28, and 67 of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710
30 make it clear that particles are rinsed off of a radial arm collector (not a planar collection surface) to

1 obtain a liquid sample (note the particles are not analyzed while on the collection surface). Thus, the
2 claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 do not anticipate the pending claims.

3 Pending Claims 27 and 57 further recite a homing sensor, whose functional characteristics are
4 not encompassed by the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710. Pending Claim 39 further recites
5 *means for translocating the collection surface* relative to the relative to the nozzle, the analyzer, and
6 the surface regenerator. The claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 do not disclose an equivalent
7 means.

8 Pending Claims are NOT Obvious Variants of the Claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710

9 The Examiner has asserted that although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not
10 patently distinct from each other because all are directed to a device comprising an impaction plate,
11 a nozzle for directing the sample to the plate, means to analyze the sample, and means to move and
12 regenerate the surface for application of additional samples.

13 Applicants respectfully disagree. As noted above, each pending independent claim recites the
14 following elements: *a planar collection surface, a surface regenerator for regenerating the*
15 *collection surface such that particles collected before regenerating the collection surface are*
16 *substantially no longer present to contaminate a spot of particles collected after regenerating the*
17 *collection surface, and an analyzer configured to analyze the collected particles while they are*
18 *retained on the collection surface.*

19 With respect to a planar collection surface that is regenerated so that previously collected
20 particles are not present to contaminate subsequently collected particles, Claims 22, 28, and 67 of
21 U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 teach rinsing off particles from a radial arm collector (not a planar
22 collection surface) to obtain a liquid sample. Significantly, there is no teaching that any collection
23 surface disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,887,701 is substantially cleaned and prepared such that it can
24 be used again for surface collection. Note that simply because some particles are removed from a
25 collection surface to produce a liquid sample does not mean that the collection surface can be re-used
26 without previously collected particles contaminating subsequently collected particles.

27 Even more importantly, Claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,701 do not teach or suggest
28 analyzing particles while they are retained upon the collection surface. The claims of U.S. Patent
29 No. 6,887,710 disclose analyzing particles in a gas flow (particle counters) or in a liquid sample.
30 MPEP 2143.01 specifically provides that "if the proposed modification or combination of the prior art

1 would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings
2 of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” Modifying U.S. Patent
3 No. 6,887,701 such that the particles are analyzed while retained on the collection surface would
4 impermissibly change the principle of operation disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,887,701.

5 Furthermore, absent hindsight, there appears to be no reasonable basis for an artisan of
6 ordinary skill to modify the claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,887,701 to achieve a system including the
7 following elements: *a planar collection surface, a surface regenerator for regenerating the collection*
8 *surface such that particles collected before regenerating the collection surface are substantially no*
9 *longer present to contaminate a spot of particles collected after regenerating the collection surface,*
10 *and an analyzer configured to analyze the collected particles while they are retained on the collection*
11 *surface.*

12 It should also be noted that pending Claims 27 and 57 further recite a homing sensor, whose
13 functional characteristics are not encompassed by the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710. Nor is
14 there any evidence that an artisan of ordinary skill would have been lead to modify the claims of U.S.
15 Patent No. 6,887,710 to incorporate such an element.

16 Pending Claim 39 further recites *means for translocating the collection surface* relative to the
17 relative to the nozzle, the analyzer, and the surface regenerator. Again, the claims in U.S. Patent
18 No. 6,887,710 do not disclose an equivalent means, nor is there any evidence that an artisan of
19 ordinary skill would have been lead to modify the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,887,710 to incorporate
20 such an element.

21 In consideration of the amendments to the claims and the submission of a Terminal
22 Disclaimer, it is applicants’ position that all claims in the current application are patentable over the
23 art of record. The Examiner is thus requested to pass this case to issue without further delay. In the
24 event that any other issues remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants’ attorney at the
25 number listed below.

26 Respectfully submitted,

27
28 /mike king/
29 Michael C. King
30 Registration No. 44,832

SKM/RMA:elm